

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

JAN 09 2007

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Docket No. 6218-3

Applicant: Hooshang Kaen

Serial No.: 09/836,909

Filed: April 17, 2001

Group: 3624

Examiner: Lalita M. Hamilton

Fax: 571-273-6743

For: INTEGRATED AUCTION SYSTEM

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION

Applicant is grateful for the opportunity to conduct a telephonic interview with Examiner Hamilton on Wednesday December 20, 2006. In that interview, Applicant clarified previous arguments made in the reply (dated July 21, 2006) to the first Office Action, and presented new arguments that were not asserted in that reply. Following, is further clarification of Applicant's arguments distinguishing the claimed invention from Friedland.

Of the arguments that were not previously made, Applicant respectfully submits that while Friedland teaches monitoring the state of one or more live auctions, Friedland does not teach or suggest "tracking multiple auctions with corresponding live images and bids," as required by dependent claim 8. For example, Friedland merely discloses "a database that computationally mirrors the states of one or more live auctions," "a computational snapshot in time of the state of all ongoing auctions," and maintaining "computational image of live auctions stored in the DLA database." (See Friedland col. 3, lines 30-34; col. 8, lines 61-67; col. 19, lines 50-56, respectively). Applicant respectfully submits that a "computational image" or "snapshot" is not a live image of the good being auctioned, instead it is a derivative computed value representing the status of multiple auctions. In other words, Friedland's disclosure of displaying "textual, graphical, or a combination of textual and graphical information concerning the selected lot to the client in an informational screen 722" describes a chart, or the like, conveying

information about the lot. (See Friedland col. 12, lines 61-65). Therefore, Friedland's "graphical information" cannot be equated with Applicant's "live image." For at least that reason, Applicant respectfully submits that what is recited in dependent claim 8 is very different from what is disclosed in Friedland.

Of the arguments that were previously made in Applicant's reply to the first Office Action, Applicant respectfully submits that Friedland does not teach or suggest "**storing into a server at least the live images of the property being auctioned,**" as required by claim 1. Friedland merely teaches a database "that stores detailed information about both on-going and upcoming auctions." (See Friedland at col. 3, lines 32-34). The detailed information stored by Friedland does not include live images.

On page 3 of the Final Office Action, it is argued that "Friedland discloses that the live auction images are stored in a database to update the auction status screen displayed to the remote bidder (col. 19, line 25-55)." Applicant respectfully submits that in the cited portion, and throughout the reference, Friedland merely discloses maintaining a correspondence between the "**computational image** of live auctions stored in the DLA database," and generating a status message to update the auction status screen displayed to remote bidders. (See Friedland at col. 19, lines 50-56 - emphasis added). As argued above, Applicant respectfully submits that the "**computational image**" stored in the DLA database is not a live image of the good being auctioned.

While Friedland does disclose broadcasting the live auction over the Internet (Fig. 3), which may require some kind of temporary storage that buffers the image data in order to facilitate its transmission over the internet, this type of temporary storage is transitory in nature

and not a database. Although neither temporary nor permanent storage is taught by Friedland, if necessary in order to place claim 1 in a condition for allowance, Applicant proposes to amend claim 1 by adding the limitation: "wherein previously stored lives images are retrievable at a future date upon the request of a user." Similarly, independent claims 9 and 15 would be amended by adding "wherein all scenes are retrievable at a future date upon the request of a user," and independent claim 20 would be amended by adding "wherein the description and live image of the auctioned property and the real time video image of a scene depicting a live auction are retrievable at a future date upon the request of a user." Claim 22 would be amended by adding: "wherein at least one of the display areas depicts multiple live images corresponding to multiple properties being auctioned." Finally, claim 23 would be amended by adding: "wherein the description and live video image of the auctioned property and the real time video image of a scene depicting the live auction are retrievable at a future date upon the request of a user." These amendments are supported at least in paragraphs 35-38 ("data storage system") of the Applicant's original disclosure.

In conclusion, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the responsive amendment previously filed, and if necessary, an Examiner's amendment as suggested herein to place the claims in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,



Victor Siber
Reg. No. 25,149

Date: December 22, 2006

Customer No. 27383
Telephone: 212 878-8429